

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REV

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no person is required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.



PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

MOR03334P02010US

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on September 30, 2008

Signature

Typed or printed name

Karen A. Sanderson

Application Number

10/619,161

Filed

July 14, 2006

First Named Inventor

Mary I. Grilliot et al

Art Unit

2134

Examiner

Jacob Lipman

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the



applicant/inventor.



assignee of record of the entire interest.

See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

attorney or agent of record.

Registration number 37,825



attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34

Signature

Jeffery N. Fairchild

Typed or printed name

312/876-1800

Telephone number

September 30, 2008

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.



*Total of 2 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.



MOR03334P02010US
PATENT

STATEMENT FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8 stand are pending and at issue. Claims 3 and 7 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8 stand rejected as anticipated by Larson et al (US 2004/0056089).

The clear error in the rejection is that Larson et al fails to show, or even suggest, all of the structure and/or steps recited in the claims.

Discussion

Novel Steps and Structure Recited in the Claims

Independent claim 1 recites the steps of entering a photograph image of each authorized person into a database which is maintained in a portable or hand-held computer; reading the data displayed or recorded by each token presented by a person seeking entry; and the portable or hand-held computer comparing the sent data to the database and displaying the photographic image entered on the database of the person identified by the sent data, via the display.

Independent method claim 2 recites the steps of entering a photograph image of each person of a larger population into a database, which is maintained in a portable or hand-held computer; reading the data displayed or recorded by each token presented by a person seeking entry; and the portable or hand-held computer comparing the sent data

to the database and displaying the photographic image entered on the database of the person identified by the sent data, via the display.

Independent claims 5 and 6 are directed towards a system and recite a portable or hand-held computer having a display and maintaining a database, into which has been entered a photograph image of each person to whom one of has been issued, means including an electronic reader for reading the data displayed or recorded by each token presented by a person seeking entry and for sending the read data to the portable or hand-held computer; and wherein the portable or hand-held computer is programmed to compare the sent data to the database and to display, via the display, the photographic image entered on the database of the person identified by the sent data. Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, these steps and structure are neither shown nor suggested by Larson et al.

**Larson et al Fails to Show or Suggest the Step of Entering a
Photographic Image of Each Authorized Person into a Database
Which Is Maintained in a Portable Computer or Handheld Computer**

Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, the step of entering a photographic image of each authorized person into a database which is maintained in a portable computer or hand-held computer is neither shown nor suggested in Larson et al, let alone shown or suggested in paragraphs 0031 and 0027 of Larson et al as erroneously asserted in the rejection. Rather, paragraph 0031 is directed to the production of "a security card, badge or tag" for each approved vendor employee, and paragraph 0027 is discussing

individual sponsor entities 70, rather than the portable handheld device reader 30 described in paragraph 0019. While Larson et al does disclose the idea of entering information about authorized persons into a database, it doesn't in any way disclose or suggest that the database should be maintained in the handheld device 30 described in paragraph 0019 of Larson et al. For this reason alone, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Larson et Al Fails to Disclose or Suggest That the Portable or Handheld Computer 30 Actually Compares the Sent Data Read from its Identifier Devices to a Database Containing Information of Each Authorized Person That Is Maintained in its Portable or Handheld Device 30

Larson et al does not disclose that the portable or handheld computer 30 actually compares the sent data read from its identifier devices to a database containing information of each authorized person, let alone to such a database that is maintained in its portable or handheld device 30. In this regard, paragraph 0072 is limited to discussing how a portable device 30 having a portable radio frequency identifier device could be used to perform the card reading functions described in paragraphs 0069, 0070 and 0071. Furthermore, it is noted that there is nothing in paragraphs 0069-0072 stating where the step of comparing the sent data to the database is performed, let alone that it could be performed in the handheld reader device 30. Additionally, while paragraph 0075 mentions distributed devices and databases at the sponsor locations, it does not state or even imply that the databases could be maintained in handheld device 30, let alone that read and sent data could be compared to a database that is maintained in a handheld device 30.

Paragraph 0076 of Larson et al adds nothing in this regard. For this additional reason alone, the §102 rejection of the claims is improper and should be withdrawn.

**The Present Office Action's Response to the
Above Arguments Mischaracterizes Larson et al**

Paragraph 3 at page 3 of the present Office Action mischaracterizes the disclosure of Larson et al. More specifically, in response to Applicants' arguments, the present Office Action asserts that "Larson et al discloses a system where vendors enroll in a database that is centrally located and also **synched to multiple handheld units (0075)**". (emphasis added). However, contrary to this assertion, there is nothing in paragraph 0075 to indicate or even imply that the databases are **maintained** in the handheld device 30 of Larson et al, let alone that read and sent data could be compared to a database that is maintained in its handheld device 30, as recited in the rejected claims. Furthermore, paragraph 3 of the Office Action further asserts that "The data stored in these handheld units includes photographs of the vendors which are displayed on the handheld devices (0071)". However, again contrary to this assertion, there is nothing in paragraph 0071 that indicates that the data is stored in the handheld units as a database. Rather, paragraph 0071 simply indicates that the card reader displays the user's photograph and other appropriate data. At best, this is an indication that the system database, which is not maintained in the card reader, forwards the specific user's photograph and data to the card reader for display.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of the claims and allowance of the case.